

Model order reduction for discrete time-delay systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions

Xiaolong Wang^{a,*}, Kejia Xu^a

^a*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an 710072, China*

Abstract

We propose two kinds of model order reduction methods for discrete time-delay systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions. The peculiar properties of discrete Walsh functions are directly utilized to compute the Walsh coefficients of the systems, and the projection matrix is defined properly to generate reduced models by taking into account the non-zero initial conditions. It is shown that reduced models can preserve some Walsh coefficients of the expansion of the original systems. Further, the superposition principle is exploited to achieve a decomposition of the original systems, and a new definition of Gramians is proposed by combining the individual Gramians of each subsystem. As a result, the balanced truncation method is applied to systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions. We also provide a low-rank approximation to Gramians based on the discrete Laguerre polynomials, which enables an efficient execution of our approach. Numerical examples confirm the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed methods.

Keywords: Model order reduction, Discrete time-delay systems, Inhomogeneous initial condition, Balanced truncation

1. Introduction

Time-delay systems (TDSs) permeate a multitude of fields to describe the process occurring in non-instantaneous manner, such as biology, physics, and engineering sciences [1, 2]. In practice, high order TDSs arise frequently in the accurate description of complicated physical phenomena, which pose a great challenge for the system analysis and numerical computation. Model order reduction (MOR) is a powerful tool to reduce large-scale systems into a more manageable low-dimensional framework. It preserves the core properties of the original systems while diminishes dramatically the computational burden and data storage in the simulation.

In recent years, a plenty of MOR strategies have been extensively studied, including moment-matching method [3], balanced truncation (BT) [4, 5], and the kind of data-driven methodologies [6–8]. Nonetheless, the dominant MOR techniques are predicated on the assumption of systems with zero initial conditions, which may incur large errors when the systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions are simplified via these kinds of MOR methods. The specific schemes oriented to large-scale systems with non-zero initial conditions deserve to be future exploited.

*Corresponding author

Email address: xlwang@nwpu.edu.cn (Xiaolong Wang)

In this work, we consider discrete TDSs governed by the difference equations

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = A_0x(t) + A_1x(t-d) + Bu(t), \\ y(t) = Cx(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty) \\ x(t) = \varphi(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0] \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the input, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the output, and $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the state vector. The above systems are determined by the constant real matrices A_0 , A_1 , B and C with compatible dimensions, along with the time delay d and the initial conditions $\varphi(t)$. We aim to construct reduced models

$$\begin{cases} \hat{x}(t+1) = \hat{A}_0\hat{x}(t) + \hat{A}_1\hat{x}(t-d) + \hat{B}u(t), \\ \hat{y}(t) = \hat{C}\hat{x}(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty) \\ \hat{x}(t) = \hat{\varphi}(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0] \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where the state $\hat{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^r$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\hat{y}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, respectively. Here the coefficient matrices $\hat{A}_0 = W^T A_0 V$, $\hat{A}_1 = W^T A_1 V$, $\hat{B} = W^T B$ and $\hat{C} = CV$ are determined by the projection matrices $V, W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$. Although a single delay is contained in (1), all results obtained in this paper can be applied readily to the systems with multiple delays via some proper modification.

There exist several MOR methods for TDSs with zero initial values. The moment-matching methods have been well studied for TDSs, and the greedy iterations proposed in [9, 10] can be employed to select the expansion points in the frequency domain. Instead of Taylor expansion, a higher order Krylov subspace algorithm based on a Laguerre expansion technique is considered for MOR of TDSs in [11, 12]. Besides, the time domain reduction techniques are built up for TDSs with the aid of the nice properties of orthogonal polynomials [13, 14]. BT methods have also been extended to TDSs via properly defined Gramians and Lyapunov-type equations [15, 16]. With the low-rank approximation to Gramians, one can obviate solving the Lyapunov-type equations directly and carry out the procedure of BT with relatively lower costs [12, 17], while the desired properties of BT, such as the preservation of stability and the strict error bound, are still in its infancy for TDSs [18, 19]. In [20, 21], TDSs are first reformulated equivalently as infinite-dimensional linear systems by spectral discretization, and then a finite-dimensional approximation via Krylov-Páde model reduction approach is used to construct delay-free reduced models. However, ignoring effects coming from time delays may cause large errors in the time domain. In [22], the dominant pole algorithm is adapted properly to a class of second order delay systems, and the reduced models can capture the dominate poles of the original systems. In addition, the problem of H_∞ has been exploited for TDSs. Although reduced models that preserve the stability and satisfy a prescribed H_∞ performance can be obtained via an optimization problem subject to linear matrix inequality constraints, the huge computational burden of the optimization problem precludes the application to large-scale settings [23, 24].

MOR with inhomogeneous initial conditions has garnered significant attention in recent times. In [25], BT methods are first extended successfully to linear systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions via adding auxiliary inputs determined by the initial data. Later, BT with singular perturbation approximation is investigated similarly, and an L_2 error bound is derived for the approximation [26]. A new alternative balancing procedure is also provided in [27] based on a shift transformation, where a priori parameter-dependent error bound is proved. Another strategy for MOR of systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions attributes to the decomposition of the full system response into the response map of several subsystems, and a new flexible MOR framework

is achieved by reducing each subsystem separately [28]. This approach is also applicable to second order systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions with the help of the superposition principle [29]. The time domain MOR techniques are modified by taking the initial data into the construction of projection matrices to ensure an accurate approximation in [30]. With the same spirit, these methods have been applied to more general systems, such as port-Hamiltonian systems and bilinear systems with non-zero initial conditions [31, 32].

To the best of our knowledge, there is no dedicated work on the exploration of MOR for discrete TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions. Note that (1) can be reformulated as a standard linear system. By defining

$$z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x(t)^T & x(t-1)^T & \cdots & x(t-d)^T \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n(d+1) \times 1},$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} z(t+1) = \bar{A}z(t) + \bar{B}u(t), \\ y(t) = \bar{C}z(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty), \\ z(0) = \begin{bmatrix} x(0)^T & x(-1)^T & \cdots & x(-d)^T \end{bmatrix}^T, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where the coefficient matrices are

$$\bar{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_0 & & & & A_1 \\ I_n & O & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & I_n & O \end{bmatrix}, \bar{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \bar{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C^T \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}^T.$$

That is, a discrete TDS is recast into a framework amenable to standard MOR techniques, such as the approaches presented in [25, 33]. However, it is necessary to construct a high-dimensional equivalent system, which increases dramatically the computational expenditure during the MOR procedure.

We propose a pair of MOR methodologies to simplify discrete TDSs with non-zero initial conditions. Using the inherent properties of the discrete Walsh function, we expand the system states over discrete Walsh functions. The expansion coefficients are determined by solving a linear equation, which takes into account the state equations as well as the initial conditions. We define the projection matrix via the expansion coefficients and derive reduced models that preserve some Walsh coefficients of the original systems. Furthermore, we decompose discrete TDSs into several subsystems via the superposition principle. For each subsystem, the controllability and observability Gramians are properly defined, which lead to the whole Gramians for discrete TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions. We also provide a scheme to calculate Gramians approximately via the expansion of system fundamental matrix over discrete Laguerre polynomials. Consequently, the entire procedure of BT for TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions is highly efficient.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a succinct review of discrete Walsh functions and discrete Laguerre polynomials. A novel MOR method based on Walsh functions is introduced in Section 3, and the property of matching Walsh coefficients is proved. In Section 4, Gramians of discrete TDSs with non-zero initial conditions are defined properly. A procedure for computing low-rank approximations on Gramians is also presented to enable an efficient execution of BT methods. In Section 5, three numerical examples are simulated to validate

the effectiveness of the proposed methodologies.

2. Preliminaries

We briefly introduce several important properties of the discrete Walsh functions and the discrete Laguerre polynomials, which benefit a lot the presentation of our main results.

2.1. Discrete Walsh functions

Walsh functions are a complete and orthogonal set on the normalized interval $(0,1)$, which consist of trains of square pulses. The corresponding discrete Walsh functions are also known as Walsh sequences or Walsh codes [34, 35]. Given a positive integer l , the i -th discrete Walsh function $W_i(k)$ is defined at $N = 2^l$ points for $i, k < N$. There are binary formulations of i and k as follows

$$(i)_{\text{decimal}} = (i_{m-1}i_{m-2} \cdots i_0)_{\text{binary}}, (k)_{\text{decimal}} = (k_{m-1}k_{m-2} \cdots k_0)_{\text{binary}}.$$

The discrete Walsh functions have the explicit expression

$$W_i(k) = (-1)^{[\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} g_j(i)k_j]}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1,$$

where $g_0(i) = i_{m-1}, g_1(i) = i_{m-1} + i_{m-2}, \dots, g_{m-1}(i) = i_1 + i_0$. The discrete Walsh functions $W_i(k)$ satisfy the orthogonal property

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} W_i(k) W_j(k) = N\delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (4)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. Each bounded signal sequence $z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n (k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1)$ can be expanded in terms of discrete Walsh functions as

$$z(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} z_i W_i(k) = ZW(k),$$

where $W(k) = [W_0(k) \ W_1(k) \ \cdots \ W_{N-1}(k)]^T$ is referred as the discrete Walsh vector, and $Z = [z_0 \ z_1 \ \cdots \ z_{N-1}]$ denotes the coefficient matrix. It follows from (4) that the elements of Z can be calculated by

$$z_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} z(k) W_i(k), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1.$$

Let $\mathcal{W} = [W(0) \ W(1) \ \cdots \ W(N-1)]$ denote the discrete Walsh matrix. It can be verified that \mathcal{W} is a symmetry matrix and there holds $\mathcal{W}^{-1} = (1/N)\mathcal{W}$ [36]. In addition, the discrete Walsh vector satisfies the following shift property

$$RW(0) = W(N-1), RW(k+1) = W(k), k = 0, 1, \dots, N-2, \quad (5)$$

where R is named as Walsh shift matrix or backward operational matrix. The shift property has the expression of matrix form

$$[W(N-1) \ W(0) \ \cdots \ W(N-2)] = R[W(0) \ W(1) \ \cdots \ W(N-1)],$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} R &= [W(N-1) \ W(0) \ \cdots \ W(N-2)]\mathcal{W}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{N}[W(N-1) \ W(0) \ \cdots \ W(N-2)]\mathcal{W}. \end{aligned}$$

Further there holds the Walsh summation property

$$\sum_{i=0}^k W(i) = SW(k), \quad (6)$$

where S is referred as the operational matrix for summation [37]. The $(i+1, j+1)$ -th element of S is determined by

$$s_{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l=0}^k W_i(l) W_j(k) \right].$$

2.2. Discrete Laguerre polynomials

The i -th discrete Laguerre polynomial $L_i(k)$ is defined as

$$L_i(k) = (-1)^i \beta_i o^k \alpha_i(k), \quad i, k = 0, 1, \dots,$$

where $\alpha_i(k) = s^i \sum_{j=0}^i \left(\frac{s-1}{s}\right)^j \binom{i}{j} \binom{k}{j}$, $\beta_i = \left(\frac{1-s}{s^i}\right)^{1/2}$, $o = s^{1/2}$, and $s \in (0, 1)$ is called the discount factor [38]. Here $\binom{i}{j}$ and $\binom{k}{j}$ are the binomial coefficients. $L_i(k)$ forms an orthonormal basis in $l_2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and there is the orthogonality property

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} L_m(k) L_n(k) = \delta_{mn}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (7)$$

Discrete Laguerre polynomials satisfy the following three-term recursive relation

$$L_{i+1}(k) = -a_i(k) s^{-1/2} L_i(k) + s^{-1} b_i L_{i-1}(k),$$

where $a_i(k) = \frac{1}{i+1} (i + (i+1)s + (s-1)k)$, $b_i = -\frac{is}{i+1}$.

For a given function $f(k) \in l_2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, it has the expansion $f(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i L_i(k)$, where the Laguerre coefficient can be obtained by using orthogonal property (7), that is

$$f_i = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(k) L_i(k), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots$$

Note that f_i are also referred as the Laguerre spectrum in the existing works. The truncated series

$\hat{f}(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} f_i L_i(k)$ are optimal in the sense of minimizing the error

$$\varepsilon = \left\| f(k) - \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \tilde{f}_i L_i(k) \right\|_2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the l_2 norm, and $\tilde{f}_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $L(k) = [L_0(k) \ L_1(k) \ \cdots \ L_{N-1}(k)]^T$. The basis vector $L(k+\varsigma)$ is related with $L(k)$ by the invertible transformation

$$L(k+\varsigma) = T^\varsigma L(k), \quad (8)$$

where the shift-transformation matrix T takes on the lower triangular form

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} o & & & & \\ 1-s & o & & & \\ (-o)(1-s) & 1-s & \ddots & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & o & \\ (-o)^{N-2}(1-s) & (-o)^{N-3}(1-s) & \cdots & 1-s & o \end{bmatrix}.$$

3. MOR based on the expansion over Walsh functions

In this section, we present an efficient MOR method based on discrete Walsh functions. We prove that reduced models can preserve a certain number of discrete Walsh coefficients of the original systems.

For given bounded non-zero initial values $x(j), j \in [-d, 0]$ in (1), we have the expansion over discrete Walsh functions

$$x(j) = [x(j) \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0]W(N-1) = Q_j W(N-1), \quad (9)$$

where $Q_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$. The summation of the state equation in (1) from 0 to $N-1$ (assuming without loss of generality that $N > d$) has the expression

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x(i+1) = A_0 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x(i) + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x(i-d) + B \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u(i).$$

By isolating the initial values, the above equality is rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x(i+1) = A_0 x(0) + A_0 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} x(i) + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d x(i-d) + A_1 \sum_{i=d+1}^{N-1} x(i-d) + B \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u(i). \quad (10)$$

We consider the truncated expansion $x(i+1) \approx \mathcal{X}W(i)$ of the state in (1), where $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$ is the discrete Walsh coefficient matrix. Similarly, the truncated expansion of $u(i)$ reads $u(i) \approx UW(i)$.

Consequently, it follows from shift property (5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} x(i) &= A_0 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}W(i-1) = A_0 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}RW(i) - A_0 \mathcal{X}RW(0), \\
A_1 \sum_{i=d+1}^{N-1} x(i-d) &= A_1 \sum_{i=d+1}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}W(i-1-d) \\
&= A_1 \sum_{i=d+1}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}R^{d+1}W(i) \\
&= A_1 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}R^{d+1}W(i) - A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d \mathcal{X}R^{N+d-i}W(N-1).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Substituting (9) and (11) into (10) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}W(i) &= A_0 Q_0 W(N-1) + A_0 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}RW(i) - A_0 \mathcal{X}RW(0) + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d Q_{i-d} W(N-1) \\
&\quad + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}R^{d+1}W(i) - A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d \mathcal{X}R^{N+d-i}W(N-1) + B \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} UW(i).
\end{aligned}$$

Because of Walsh summation property (6), the above equality boils down to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{X}SW(N-1) &= A_0 Q_0 W(N-1) + A_0 \mathcal{X}RSW(N-1) - A_0 \mathcal{X}RW(0) + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d Q_{i-d} W(N-1) \\
&\quad + A_1 \mathcal{X}R^{d+1}SW(N-1) - A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d \mathcal{X}R^{N+d-i}W(N-1) + BUSW(N-1).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $RW(0) = W(N-1)$. The above equality implies that \mathcal{X} solves linear matrix equation

$$\mathcal{X}S = A_0 Q_0 + A_0 \mathcal{X}RS - A_0 \mathcal{X} + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d Q_{i-d} + A_1 \mathcal{X}R^{d+1}S - A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d \mathcal{X}R^{N+d-i} + BUS. \tag{12}$$

One can calculate \mathcal{X} via the following linear equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(S^T \otimes I_n - (RS)^T \otimes A_0 + I_N \otimes A_0 - (R^{d+1}S)^T \otimes A_1 + \sum_{i=0}^d (R^{N+d-i})^T \otimes A_1 \right) \text{vec}(\mathcal{X}) \\
&= (I_N \otimes A_0) \text{vec}(Q_0) + \sum_{i=0}^d (I_N \otimes A_1) \text{vec}(Q_{i-d}) + (S^T \otimes B) \text{vec}(U),
\end{aligned}$$

where \otimes is the Kronecker product, and $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ represents the column stacking operator.

Now we are in a position to construct reduced models using projection methods. We choose

the projection matrix V as an orthogonal basis matrix of the following subspace

$$\text{colspan}\{V\} = \text{colspan}\{\mathcal{X} \quad x(0) \quad \cdots \quad x(-d)\}. \quad (13)$$

Note that the number of columns of V may be less than $N + d + 1$, and we refer $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ for simplicity. We make the choice $W = V$ and get Algorithm 1 for MOR of discrete TDSs with non-zero initial conditions.

Algorithm 1 MOR of discrete TDSs based on Walsh functions (MOR-Walsh-TDS)

Input: Coefficient matrices A_0, A_1, B, C , delay d , parameter N , and initial conditions $x(j)$

Output: Reduced coefficient matrices $\hat{A}_0, \hat{A}_1, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$, and reduced initial conditions $\hat{x}(j)$

- 1: Compute the Walsh coefficient matrix via linear equation (12);
- 2: Construct the projection matrix V by (13) such that $V^T V = I_r$;
- 3: Generate the coefficient matrices of reduced models

$$\hat{A}_0 = V^T A_0 V, \hat{A}_1 = V^T A_1 V, \hat{B} = V^T B, \hat{C} = C V, \hat{x}(j) = V^T x(j).$$

Remark 1. Reduced models generated by Algorithm 1 are associated with the initial values $x(j), j \in [-d, 0]$, as well as the specific input $u(t)$. If $x(j) = 0$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$, Algorithm 1 degenerates naturally to MOR techniques for systems with homogeneous initial conditions. We refer the reader to [13] for more details.

For reduced models, the initial values $\hat{x}(j)$ can also be expressed via discrete Walsh functions

$$\hat{x}(j) = [\hat{x}(j) \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0] W(N-1) = \hat{Q}(j) W(N-1),$$

and the state $\hat{x}(k+1)$ has the truncated expansion

$$\hat{x}(k+1) \approx \hat{\mathcal{X}} W(k),$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ is the discrete Walsh coefficient matrix. We get the following lemma.

Lemma 1. If the projection matrix V satisfies (13), then there holds $\mathcal{X} = V \hat{\mathcal{X}}, x(j) = V \hat{x}(j)$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$, where \mathcal{X} and $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ are the discrete Walsh coefficient matrices of (1) and (2), respectively.

Proof. It follows from (13) that $\text{colspan}\{\mathcal{X}\} \subseteq \text{colspan}\{V\}$, $x(j) \in \text{colspan}\{V\}$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$. There is a matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ such that $\mathcal{X} = V \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. Besides, there holds $x(j) = V \tilde{x}(j)$, where $\tilde{x}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^r$. We have $\tilde{x}(j) = V^T x(j) = \hat{x}(j)$, implying that $x(j) = V \hat{x}(j)$. We get $Q(j) = V \hat{Q}(j)$.

Now (12) can be reformulated as

$$V \tilde{\mathcal{X}} S = A_0 V \hat{Q}_0 + A_0 V \tilde{\mathcal{X}} R S - A_0 V \tilde{\mathcal{X}} + A_1 V \sum_{i=0}^d \hat{Q}_{i-d} + A_1 V \tilde{\mathcal{X}} R^{d+1} S - A_1 \sum_{i=0}^d V \tilde{\mathcal{X}} R^{N+d-i} + B U S.$$

Multiplying both sides of the above equation from left by V^T , it reads

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}}S = \hat{A}_0\hat{Q}_0 + \hat{A}_0\tilde{\mathcal{X}}RS - \hat{A}_0\tilde{\mathcal{X}} + \hat{A}_1\sum_{i=0}^d\hat{Q}_{i-d} + \hat{A}_1\tilde{\mathcal{X}}R^{d+1}S - \hat{A}_1\sum_{i=0}^d\tilde{\mathcal{X}}R^{N+d-i} + \hat{B}US,$$

which is exactly the linear equation used to calculate the discrete Walsh coefficient matrix for reduced models. Due to the uniqueness of the solution, we conclude that $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, $\mathcal{X} = V\hat{\mathcal{X}}$, and $x(j) = V\hat{x}(j)$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$. \square

If the outputs of original systems and reduced models have the truncated expansion $y(k) \approx YW(k)$, $\hat{y}(k) \approx \hat{Y}W(k)$, respectively, where $Y, \hat{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times N}$, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. If the projection matrix V satisfies (13), then reduced models match the first N discrete Walsh coefficients of the output of original systems, that is, $Y = \hat{Y}$.

Proof. The summation of $y(k) = Cx(k)$ from 0 to $N - 1$ is expressed as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} y(i) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} Cx(i) = Cx(0) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} Cx(i).$$

It can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} YW(i) = CQ_0W(N-1) + C\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}RW(i) - C\mathcal{X}RW(0).$$

It follows from (6) that

$$YSW(N-1) = CQ_0W(N-1) + C\mathcal{X}RSW(N-1) - C\mathcal{X}RW(0).$$

Because of $RW(0) = W(N-1)$, we have

$$YS = CQ_0 + C\mathcal{X}RS - C\mathcal{X}.$$

By Lemma 1, there hold $\mathcal{X} = V\hat{\mathcal{X}}$, $x(0) = V\hat{x}(0)$. The above equality reads

$$\begin{aligned} YS &= CV\hat{Q}_0 + CV\hat{\mathcal{X}}RS - CV\hat{\mathcal{X}} \\ &= \hat{C}\hat{Q}_0 + \hat{C}\hat{\mathcal{X}}RS - \hat{C}\hat{\mathcal{X}} \\ &= \hat{Y}S, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to $Y = \hat{Y}$ and concludes the proof. \square

4. BT for MOR of discrete TDSs

We consider BT methods of discrete TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions in this section. Due to the linearity of (1), we first decompose the systems via the superposition principle, and then propose a new BT procedure based on the properly defined Gramians.

4.1. Decomposition of discrete TDSs

The transfer function of (1) is available by performing Z -transformation if the initial conditions $x(j) = 0$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$. However, the situation becomes more complex in the case of inhomogeneous initial conditions. We aim to decompose the system behavior of (1) into several simple subsystems so as to define Gramians for systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions. The Z -transformation of $x(t)$, $u(t)$ and $y(t)$ is defined via

$$X(z) = \mathcal{Z}[x(t)] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x(i)z^{-i}, U(z) = \mathcal{Z}[u(t)] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} u(i)z^{-i}, Y(z) = \mathcal{Z}[y(t)] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} y(i)z^{-i},$$

respectively. There hold

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}[x(t+1)] &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x(i+1)z^{-i} = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} x(l)z^{-l+1} = z \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} x(l)z^{-l} - zx(0) = zX(z) - zx(0), \\ \mathcal{Z}[x(t-d)] &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x(i-d)z^{-i} = \sum_{l=-d}^{\infty} x(l)z^{-(l+d)} = z^{-d} \sum_{l=-d}^{\infty} x(l)z^{-l} \\ &= z^{-d} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} x(l)z^{-l} + z^{-d} \sum_{l=-d}^{-1} x(l)z^{-l} \\ &= z^{-d}X(z) + z^{-d} \sum_{l=-d}^{-1} x(l)z^{-l}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, in the frequency domain (1) are rewritten as

$$zX(z) - zx(0) = A_0X(z) + A_1z^{-d}X(z) + A_1z^{-d} \sum_{l=-d}^{-1} x(l)z^{-l} + BU(z).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Y(z) &= CX(z) \\ &= C(zI - A_0 - z^{-d}A_1)^{-1} \left(BU(z) + zx(0) + A_1z^{-d} \sum_{l=-d}^{-1} x(l)z^{-l} \right) \\ &= CF(z)BU(z) + CF(z)zx(0) + CF(z)A_1z^{-d} \sum_{l=-d}^{-1} x(l)z^{-l}, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(z) = (zI - A_0 - z^{-d}A_1)^{-1}$. We restrict each initial value $x(j)$ to an individual subspace spanned by the basis matrix $X_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_0}$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$. There is a vector $w_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ such that $x(j) = X_j w_j$. Consequently, the input-output relationship of (1) can be decomposed into three

parts

$$\begin{aligned} Y(z) &= CF(z)BU(z) + CF(z)zX_0w_0 + CF(z)A_1z^{-d}\sum_{j=-d}^{-1}X_jw_jz^{-j} \\ &= H_{zero}(z)U(z) + H_{x_0}(z)w_0 + \sum_{j=-d}^{-1}H_{neg}^j(z)w_j, \end{aligned}$$

where $H_{zero}(z) = CF(z)B$, $H_{x_0}(z) = CF(z)zX_0$, and $H_{neg}^j(z) = CF(z)A_1z^{-d}X_jz^{-j}$ for $j \in [-d, -1]$.

We define auxiliary subsystems based on the above decomposition, and then the output of original systems is a superposition of these subsystems. Clearly, $H_{zero}(z)$ is the transfer function of the following discrete TDSs with homogeneous initial conditions

$$\Omega_{zero} : \begin{cases} x_{zero}(t+1) = A_0x_{zero}(t) + A_1x_{zero}(t-d) + Bu(t), \\ y_{zero}(t) = Cx_{zero}(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty), \\ x_{zero}(t) = 0, t \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0]. \end{cases}$$

$H_{x_0}(z) = CF(z)zX_0$ corresponds to Ω_{x_0} along with just one non-zero initial condition, which is defined as

$$\Omega_{x_0} : \begin{cases} x_{x_0}(t+1) = A_0x_{x_0}(t) + A_1x_{x_0}(t-d), \\ y_{x_0}(t) = Cx_{x_0}(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty), \\ x_{x_0}(0) = x_0, x_{x_0}(t) = 0, t \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0]. \end{cases}$$

Likewise, $H_{neg}^j(z) = CF(z)A_1z^{-d}X_jz^{-j}$ corresponds to Ω_{neg}^j along with just one non-zero initial condition $x(j)$, which is defined as

$$\Omega_{neg}^j : \begin{cases} x_{neg}(t+1) = A_0x_{neg}(t) + A_1x_{neg}(t-d), \\ y_{neg}(t) = Cx_{neg}(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty), \\ x_{neg}(j) = x(j), x_{neg}(t) = 0, t \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0] \setminus j. \end{cases}$$

In what follows, we use the denotations $*_{zero}, *_{x_0}, *_{neg}$ to denote variables associated with each subsystem defined above. One can verify that

$$Y(z) = Y_{zero}(z) + Y_{x_0}(z) + \sum_{j=-d}^{-1}Y_{neg}^j(z),$$

where $Y_{zero}(z), Y_{x_0}(z)$ and $Y_{neg}^j(z)$ represent Z -transformation of $y_{zero}(t), y_{x_0}(t)$ and the output of Ω_{neg}^j , respectively. As a result, the output of (1) is the summation of that of the subsystems $\Omega_{zero}, \Omega_{x_0}$ and Ω_{neg}^j . If one construct reduced models for each subsystem properly, the dynamical behavior of (1) would be well approximated by the superposition of reduced order subsystems.

4.2. MOR based on BT methods

BT is an efficient approach to perform MOR. For discrete TDSs, the fundamental matrix is the focus of BT methods [39].

Definition 1. For the given discrete TDSs (1) with homogeneous initial condition, the solution matrix $\Psi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of the following differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(t+1) &= A_0 \Psi(t) + A_1 \Psi(t-d) \\ \Psi(0) &= I, \Psi(\tau) = O \quad \tau \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

is called the fundamental matrix of (1).

Let \mathcal{P}_{zero} and \mathcal{Q}_{zero} denote the controllable and observable Gramians of the subsystem Ω_{zero} , respectively. They can be formulated as follows

$$\mathcal{P}_{zero} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) B B^T \Psi^T(t), \quad \mathcal{Q}_{zero} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi^T(t) C^T C \Psi(t). \quad (15)$$

(15) is well defined for the exponentially stable discrete TDSs. Clearly, \mathcal{P}_{zero} and \mathcal{Q}_{zero} are positive semi-definite matrices. The subsystem Ω_{zero} can be simplified by the standard BT approach presented in [16].

We now consider the subsystem Ω_{x_0} . Due to the multiplier z , $H_{x_0}(z) = CF(z)zX_0$ is not a standard expression in the frequency domain, and it can not be simplified directly via the techniques designed for systems with homogeneous initial conditions. However, if one conducts the structure-preserving MOR for Ω_{x_0} by using projection methods, the resulting reduced subsystem would possess the similar expression in the frequency domain. Specifically, the multiplier z still appears in the reduced subsystem of Ω_{x_0} in the frequency domain. Thanks to this observation. We then switch to the transfer function

$$\bar{H}_{x_0}(z) = CF(z)X_0$$

for MOR of Ω_{x_0} . Note that an accurate approximation to $\bar{H}_{x_0}(z)$ naturally results in a good approximation to $H_{x_0}(z)$ in the framework of the structure-preserving MOR. To this end, we define the following TDSs with homogeneous initial conditions

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = A_0 x(t) + A_1 x(t-d) + X_0 u_{x_0}(t), \\ y(t) = Cx(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}[0, \infty), \\ x(t) = 0, t \in \mathbb{Z}[-d, 0]. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Let \mathcal{P}_{x_0} and \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} be the controllable Gramian and observable Gramian of (16), respectively. \mathcal{P}_{x_0} and \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} can be defined explicitly as

$$\mathcal{P}_{x_0} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) X_0 X_0^T \Psi^T(t), \quad \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi^T(t) C^T C \Psi(t).$$

Then one can assemble the projection matrices via the BT method based on (16), and the reduced subsystems of Ω_{x_0} can be produced via projection methods.

The subsystems Ω_{neg}^j can be manipulated similarly for $j \in [-d, -1]$. We turn to

$$\bar{H}_{neg}^j(z) = CF(z)A_1 X_j$$

in order to approximate $H_{neg}^j(z)$. Note that $\bar{H}_{neg}^j(z)$ correspond to the auxiliary subsystems with

homogeneous initial conditions and the input matrix $A_1 X_j$. Specifically, the controllable Gramian and observable Gramian for the auxiliary subsystems are defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_{neg}^j = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) (A_1 X_j) (A_1 X_j)^T \Psi^T(t), \mathcal{Q}_{neg}^j = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi^T(t) C^T C \Psi(t).$$

To summarize, one can apply the BT method to each subsystem based on the Gramians defined above, and approximate the output of (1) by the superimposition of outputs of each reduced subsystem. However, it would be more advantageous to simplify (1) as a whole with unified projection matrices in some applications. Moreover, a unified structure-preserving reduced models facilitate a lot the system synthesis in engineering. To this end, we propose a new controllable Gramian \mathcal{P} by integrating the information coming from the controllable Gramians of subsystems, which is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{P}_{zero} + \mathcal{P}_{x_0} + \sum_{j=-d}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{neg}^j \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) B B^T \Psi^T(t) + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) X_0 X_0^T \Psi^T(t) + \sum_{j=-d}^{-1} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) (A_1 X_j) (A_1 X_j)^T \Psi^T(t). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The observable Gramian \mathcal{Q} of (1) is defined as

$$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{zero} = \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = \mathcal{Q}_{neg}^j. \quad (18)$$

With the new Gramians (17) and (18), BT methods can be applied directly to discrete TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions.

4.3. Low-rank approximation on Gramians for BT methods

The main cost of BT methods is dominated by the calculation of Gramians, which always involves the solution of delay Lyapunov equations. The low-rank approximation to Gramians is extensively exploited for MOR of delay-free systems to reduce the computational costs. In this subsection, we present a strategy on the fast calculation of Gramians based on discrete Laguerre polynomials, which enables an efficient execution of our approach.

We consider the truncated expansion of the fundamental matrix $\Psi(t)$ over discrete Laguerre polynomials

$$\Psi(t) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t),$$

where F_i represent discrete Laguerre coefficients. It follows that

$$\Psi(t+1) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t+1), \Psi(t-d) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t-d).$$

Substituting the above approximation into (14) leads to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t+1) = A_0 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t) + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t-d). \quad (19)$$

Due to the shift property given in (8), there holds

$$L_i(t+1) = \sum_{j=0}^i \hat{g}_{ij} L_j(t), \quad L_i(t-d) = \sum_{j=0}^i \tilde{g}_{ij} L_j(t),$$

where \hat{g}_{ij} and \tilde{g}_{ij} denote the $((i+1), (j+1))$ -th element of T and T^{-d} , respectively. Note that both T and T^{-d} are lower triangular matrices. Consequently, (19) is rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \hat{g}_{ij} L_j(t) = A_0 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t) + A_1 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{g}_{ij} L_j(t).$$

By equating the coefficients of $L_i(t)$, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=i}^{k-1} F_j \hat{g}_{ji} = A_0 F_i + A_1 \sum_{j=i}^{k-1} F_j \tilde{g}_{ji}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1.$$

Besides, there holds $\Psi(0) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(0) = I$ by using $\Psi(0) = I$. With the denotation $\mathcal{F} = [F_0^T \ \dots \ F_{k-1}^T]^T$, we get the linear equation

$$\mathcal{A}\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}, \quad (20)$$

where the coefficient matrices are determined by

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} L_0(0)I & L_1(0)I & L_2(0)I & \cdots & \cdots & L_{k-2}(0)I & L_{k-1}(0)I \\ \Delta_{0,0} & \Delta_{1,0} & \Delta_{2,0} & \ddots & \cdots & \Delta_{k-2,0} & \Delta_{k-1,0} \\ 0 & \Delta_{1,1} & \Delta_{2,1} & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \Delta_{k-3,k-3} & \Delta_{k-2,k-3} & \Delta_{k-1,k-3} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \Delta_{k-2,k-2} & \Delta_{k-1,k-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with the elements

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i,i} &= \hat{g}_{ii}I - A_0 - \tilde{g}_{ii}A_1, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-2, \\ \Delta_{j,i} &= \hat{g}_{ji}I - \tilde{g}_{ji}A_1, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-2, \quad j = i+1, \dots, k-1. \end{aligned}$$

One can obtain discrete Laguerre coefficients F_i by solving the above linear equation.

The derived F_i immediately result in a low-rank approximation to Gramians defined in (17) and (18). It follows from the orthogonality property in (7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{zero} &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Psi(t) B B^T \Psi^T(t) \\
&\approx \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t) \right) B B^T \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i L_i(t) \right)^T \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i B L_i(t) \right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i B L_i(t) \right)^T \\
&= [F_0 B \ F_1 B \ \cdots \ F_{k-1} B] \begin{bmatrix} (F_0 B)^T \\ (F_1 B)^T \\ \vdots \\ (F_{k-1} B)^T \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \mathcal{X}_{zero} \mathcal{X}_{zero}^T,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{zero} = [F_0 B \ F_1 B \ \cdots \ F_{k-1} B]$. Similarly, we have the low-rank approximation

$$\mathcal{P}_{x_0} \approx \mathcal{X}_{x_0} \mathcal{X}_{x_0}^T, \mathcal{P}_{neg}^j \approx \mathcal{X}_{neg}^j (\mathcal{X}_{neg}^j)^T,$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{x_0} = [F_0 X_{x_0} \ F_1 X_{x_0} \ \cdots \ F_{k-1} X_{x_0}]$ and $\mathcal{X}_{neg}^j = [F_0 A_1 X_j \ F_1 A_1 X_j \ \cdots \ F_{k-1} A_1 X_j]$ for $j \in [-d, -1]$. Consequently, the controllable Gramian \mathcal{P} of (1) is approximated by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{P}_{zero} + \mathcal{P}_{x_0} + \sum_{j=-d}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{neg}^j \\
&\approx \mathcal{X}_{zero} \mathcal{X}_{zero}^T + \mathcal{X}_{x_0} \mathcal{X}_{x_0}^T + \sum_{j=-d}^{-1} \mathcal{X}_{neg}^j (\mathcal{X}_{neg}^j)^T \\
&= \mathcal{X}_{in} \mathcal{X}_{in}^T,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{in} = [\mathcal{X}_{zero} \ \mathcal{X}_{x_0} \ \mathcal{X}_{neg}^{-1} \ \cdots \ \mathcal{X}_{neg}^{-d}]$. The observable Gramian \mathcal{Q} of (1) has the low-rank approximation

$$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{zero} = \mathcal{Q}_{x_0} = \mathcal{Q}_{neg}^j \approx \mathcal{Y}_{out} \mathcal{Y}_{out}^T, \tag{22}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{out} = [C F_0 \ C F_1 \ \cdots \ C F_{k-1}]$. In Algorithm 2, we present the main steps of the proposed BT procedure with the low-rank approximation.

Remark 2. Generally, reduced models generated by Algorithm 2 can not preserve the stability of (1). Alternatively, one can switch to a variation of the dominant subspace method proposed in [40] to derive stable reduced models in theory. With the derived low-rank factors $\mathcal{X}_{in}, \mathcal{Y}_{out}$, an enlarged matrix $\mathcal{Z} = [\mathcal{X}_{in} \ \mathcal{Y}_{out}]$ can be assembled first. By performing the singular value decomposition $\mathcal{Z} = U \Sigma V^T$, one can define the projection matrix $S = U(:, 1 : r)$, and then construct reduced models determined by coefficient matrices $\{S^T A_0 S, S^T A_1 S, S^T B, C S\}$, which are stable under some conditions [41].

Algorithm 2 BT combined with low-rank Gramians (MOR-Lag-combBT)

Input: Coefficient matrices A_0, A_1, B, C , delay d , parameters k and α , initial conditions $x(j) \in \text{colspan}\{X_j\}$

Output: Reduced coefficient matrices $\hat{A}_0, \hat{A}_1, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$, reduced initial conditions $\hat{x}(j)$

- 1: Calculate the discrete Laguerre coefficients F_i via linear equation (20);
 - 2: Calculate the low-rank factors $\mathcal{P} \approx \mathcal{X}_{in}\mathcal{X}_{in}^T$ and $\mathcal{Q} \approx \mathcal{Y}_{out}\mathcal{Y}_{out}^T$ by (21) and (22);
 - 3: Perform the truncated singular value decomposition $\mathcal{Y}_{out}^T\mathcal{X}_{in} = \mathcal{U}\Sigma\mathcal{V}^T$, where the diagonal elements of Σ are arranged in the decreasing order of values. Assemble the first r columns of \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} into matrices T_{1r} and T_{2r} , respectively, and the first $r \times r$ block of Σ is referred as Σ_r ;
 - 4: Construct projection matrices $W^T = \Sigma_r^{-1/2}T_{1r}^T\mathcal{Y}_{out}^T, V = \mathcal{X}_{in}T_{2r}\Sigma_r^{-1/2}$;
 - 5: Compute coefficient matrices of reduced models $\hat{A}_0 = W^T A_0 V, \hat{A}_1 = W^T A_1 V, \hat{B} = W^T B, \hat{C} = CV, \hat{x}(j) = W^T x(j)$.
-

5. Numerical examples

In this section, three numerical examples are used to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed methods. All simulation results are obtained in Matlab (R2021a) on a laptop with AMD Ryzen 7 5800U with Radeon Graphics 1.90 GHz and 16GB RAM.

In the simulation, we carry out Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 to produce the reduced models MOR-Walsh-TDS and MOR-Lag-combBT, respectively. The approach presented in [33] is conducted for comparison. Note that Ref. [33] focuses on systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions but free of time delays. We first reformulate (1) as the equivalent form defined in (3), and then construct projection matrix \hat{V} by the scheme provided in [33]. In order to backtrack to TDSs eventually, we take the partition $\hat{V} = [V_0^T \quad V_1^T \quad \cdots \quad V_d^T]^T$, and the reduced models are determined by the coefficients

$$\hat{A}_0 = V_0^T A_0 V_0, \hat{A}_1 = V_0^T A_1 V_d, \hat{B} = V_0^T B, \hat{C} = CV_0,$$

along with $\hat{x}(j) = V_{-j}^T x(j)$ for $j \in [-d, 0]$, which are referred as MOR-Walsh-TtL. Note that if we use N to denote the number of discrete Walsh coefficients to be matched, the dimension of MOR-Walsh-TtL and MOR-Walsh-TDS typically are $N + 1$ and $N + d$, respectively. In addition, the low-rank version of BT method (MOR-Lag-GramBt) given in [12] is also applied to (1) for comparison, which is designed for systems with zero initial conditions.

5.1. Controlled platoon example

A controlled platoon of vehicles can be described by a continuous TDS [42]

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= \bar{A}_0 x(t) + \bar{A}_1 x(t - \tau) + \bar{B}u(t), \\ y(t) &= \bar{C}x(t). \end{aligned}$$

The platooning problem is closely related to autonomous driving which helps a lot to reduce the human error factor and increase safety. The use of this technology may be possible in the immediate future. For more background materials and the specific formulas of the system, we refer the reader

to [43]. Here we use the forward difference to discretize the TDS with the time step $\Delta t = 0.005$, and obtain a discrete TDS

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) &= A_0 x(k) + A_1 x(k-d) + Bu(k), \\ y(k) &= Cx(k), \end{aligned}$$

where the coefficient matrices are $A_0 = I + \bar{A}_0 \Delta t$, $A_1 = \bar{A}_1 \Delta t$, $B = \bar{B} \Delta t = [0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0 \ 0.05]^T$ and $C = \bar{C} = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ | \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ | \ \dots \ | \ 0 \ 0]$. The dimension of the system is $n = 512$ with the delay $d = 1$.




Fig. 1. Left: Outputs in the time domain; Right: Absolute errors for each method

We take the initial conditions $x(0) = C^T, x(-1) = [1 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]^T$ for this example. In the simulation, the dimension of reduced models MOR-Lag-combBT and MOR-Lag-GramBt is 16, and $N = 16$ is used for the reduced models MOR-Walsh-TtL and MOR-Walsh-TDS. With the input function $u(t) = 5t \sin(0.2t)$, Figure 1 depicts the output of each reduced model in the time domain. Clearly, MOR-Lag-GramBt exhibits remarkable deviation from the time domain response of the original system, because there is no any information on the initial conditions taken into the process of MOR. The other reduced models perform very well for this example, and we hardly distinguish them clearly from the time domain response. MOR-Lag-combBT shows the best accuracy for this example in terms of the absolute error plots, and MOR-Walsh-TDS takes on slightly better approximation compared with MOR-Walsh-TtL. Table 1 lists the CPU time spent on the construction of each reduced model. As MOR-Walsh-TtL attributes to high order equivalent system (3), it takes much more CPU time to produce the reduced models. MOR-Lag-GramBt takes the least CPU time but exhibits poor accuracy.

Table 1
CPU time of Example 5.1

Method	MOR-Lag-GramBt	MOR-Walsh-TtL	MOR-Walsh-TDS	MOR-Lag-combBT
time	0.1958s	20.7464s	3.6816s	3.4600s

5.2. Convection-diffusion equation

In this example, we consider a convection-diffusion equation defined on the unit square $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ along with multiple time delays

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial x}{\partial t}(t, \varsigma) &= \Delta x(t, \varsigma) + \nabla x(t, \varsigma) + f(t, \varsigma, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2) + b(\varsigma)u(t), t \in (0, 1), \\ x(t, \varsigma) &= 0, \varsigma \in \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varsigma = [\varsigma_1, \varsigma_2]^T \in \Omega$, $f(t, \varsigma, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2) = f_1(\varsigma)x(t - \tilde{\tau}_1, \varsigma) + f_2(\varsigma)x(t - \tilde{\tau}_2, \varsigma)$ with $f_1(\varsigma) = \sin(\varsigma_1\pi)$ and $f_2(\varsigma) = \cos(\varsigma_2\pi)$, as presented in [14, 44]. We discretize the convection-diffusion equation with finite differences by an equidistant space step size $\Delta h = 1/(h + 1)$ and time step size $\Delta t = 0.1h^2$. A discrete TDS with two delays is formulated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) &= A_0x(k) + A_1x(k-d_1) + A_2x(k-d_2) + Bu(k), \\ y(k) &= Cx(k), \end{aligned}$$

where $B = e_1\Delta t$, $C = [1 \ 1 \ \dots \ 1]$ and $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 2$ in our setting. The dimension of the discrete TDSs is $n = h^2$.




Fig. 2. Left: Outputs in the time domain; Right: Absolute errors for each method

In the simulation we set $h = 25$, which yields a discrete TDS of order $n = 625$. With the initial conditions $x(0) = [1 \ 1 \ \dots \ 1]^T$, $x(-j) = e_j$ for $j \in [1, 2]$, the time domain response of systems is plotted in Figure 2 for the input function $u(t) = 5t \sin(0.2t)$. The dimension of MOR-Lag-GramBt and MOR-Lag-combBT is 16, and $N = 16$ is used for the construction of other reduced models. Because the transient response of MOR-Lag-GramBt deviates largely from the true system response as the time elapses, we drop it in the response plots for this example. The accuracy of MOR-Walsh-TDS is competitive with that of MOR-Walsh-TtL in the simulation, and MOR-Lag-combBT generated by the proposed method can match the system output with much better accuracy. Table 2 indicates that MOR-Lag-combBT costs slightly less CPU time compared with MOR-Walsh-TDS, because the dimension of linear equations involved in Algorithm 2 is lower than that of Algorithm 1. Much more CPU is spent by MOR-Walsh-TtL due the rise of system order in (3).

Table 2

CPU time of Example 5.2

Method	MOR-Lag-GramBt	MOR-Walsh-TtL	MOR-Walsh-TDS	MOR-Lag-combBT
time	0.2458	144.3298s	8.5971s	6.6296s

5.3. Rod with a distributed heating source

We consider a specific partial differential equation with two delays

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + a_0(x)v(x,t) + a_1(x)v(x,t-\tau_1) + a_2(x)v(x,t-\tau_2) + h(t), \\ x &\in [0, \pi], \quad t \geq 0, \\ v(0,t) &= v(\pi,t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_0(x) = \sin(x)$, $a_1(x) = 10^4 \cos(x)$ and $a_2(x) = 10^4 \sin(x)$. This example is adopted extensively in the field of MOR for TDSs [20, 21], which characterizes a rod with a distributed heating source, two weighted delayed feedbacks and an external control. We take the spatial discretization with the equidistant space size $\Delta x = \frac{0.01\pi}{n+1}$ and set $x_j = j\Delta x$, and the time discretization is performed with the time step $\Delta t = 0.01(\Delta x)^2$, leading to a discrete TDS with two inputs and two outputs. We set the dimension $n = 1500$ and $d_1 = 2, d_2 = 4$ in our simulation.




Fig. 3. Left: the output $y_1(t)$ in the time domain; Right: Absolute errors for each method

We use $x(0) = e_n, x(-i) = e_j$ for $j \in [1, 2, 3, 4]$ in this example. We adopt $N = 16$, and the dimension of MOR-Walsh-TtL and MOR-Walsh-TDS is 17 and 20, respectively. MOR-Lag-GramBt and MOR-Lag-combBT are of order 16. Figure 3 and 4 display the outputs and errors of each reduced model for the given input $u(t) = [0.05t \sin(0.2t) \ e^{-0.2t}]^T$. Note that MOR-Walsh-TtL fails to provide numerical results for this example due to the lack of memory, and MOR-Lag-GramBt exhibits obvious deviation which is not provided in the output plots. Clearly, the proposed two reduction methods take on satisfactory accuracy in the simulation. Table 3 shows the CPU time spent in constructing reduced models, in which MOR-Lag-combBT costs less time compared with MOR-Walsh-TDS.




Fig. 4. Left: the output $y_2(t)$ in the time domain; Right: Absolute errors for each method

Table 3

CPU time of Example 5.3

Method	MOR-Lag-GramBt	MOR-Walsh-TtL	MOR-Walsh-TDS	MOR-Lag-combBT
time	2.1002s	—	84.3798s	77.0456s

6. Conclusions

We have presented two kinds of MOR approach for discrete TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions. One is based on the expansion of systems over Walsh functions. By integrating initial conditions into the process of MOR, the resulting reduced models preserve exactly some discrete Walsh coefficients of the original systems. The other is based on the decomposition of systems. By defining new Gramians for the non-zero initial problem, the BT method is applied to discrete TDSs with inhomogeneous initial conditions. The numerical results indicate that the low-rank approximation to Gramians with the aid of discrete Laguerre polynomials is highly efficient, which dramatically reduces the CPU time of the BT method. The proposed methods have higher accuracy in some cases. It is indispensable to take into account the non-zero initial conditions for MOR of systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under grants 11871400.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest The authors declared that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] A. Seuret, L. Hetel, J. Daafouz, K. H. Johansson, Delays and Networked Control Systems, Springer Cham, 2016.

- [2] E. Fridman, *Introduction to Time-Delay Systems: Analysis and Control*, Birkhäuser Cham, 2014.
- [3] D. Rafiq, M. A. Bazaz, Model order reduction via moment-matching: a state of the art review, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* 29 (3) (2022) 1463–1483.
- [4] I. V. Gosea, M. Petreczky, A. C. Antoulas, C. Fiter, Balanced truncation for linear switched systems, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 44 (2018) 1845–1886.
- [5] I. V. Gosea, S. Gugercin, C. Beattie, Data-driven balancing of linear dynamical systems, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 44 (1) (2022) A554–A582.
- [6] A. Antoulas, C. Beattie, S. Gugercin, *Interpolatory Methods for Model Reduction*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2020.
- [7] R. Geelen, S. Wright, K. Willcox, Operator inference for non-intrusive model reduction with quadratic manifolds, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 403 (2023) 115717.
- [8] J. L. Proctor, S. L. Brunton, J. N. Kutz, Dynamic mode decomposition with control, *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 15 (1) (2016) 142–161.
- [9] G. Scarcioffi, A. Astolfi, Model reduction of neutral linear and nonlinear time-invariant time-delay systems with discrete and distributed delays, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 61 (6) (2016) 1438–1451.
- [10] D. Alfke, L. Feng, L. Lombardi, G. Antonini, P. Benner, Model order reduction for delay systems by iterative interpolation, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 122 (2021) 684–706.
- [11] E. R. Samuel, L. Knockaert, T. Dhaene, Model order reduction of time-delay systems using a Laguerre expansion technique, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers* 61 (6) (2014) 1815–1823.
- [12] X. Wang, K. Xu, L. Li, Model order reduction for discrete time-delay systems based on Laguerre function expansion, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 692 (2024) 160–184.
- [13] X. Wang, Y. Jiang, Time domain model reduction of time-delay systems via orthogonal polynomial expansions, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 369 (2020) 124816.
- [14] K. Xu, Y. Jiang, Z. Li, L. Li, Model reduction of discrete time-delay systems based on Charlier polynomials and high-order Krylov subspaces, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 661 (2023) 222–246.
- [15] T. Breiten, Structure-preserving model reduction for integro-differential equations, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 54 (6) (2016) 2992–3015.
- [16] X. Wang, G. Cheng, Balanced truncation for discrete time-delay systems via the interpretation of system energy, *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 359 (15) (2022) 8243–8264.
- [17] E. Jarlebring, J. Vanbiervliet, W. Michiels, Characterizing and computing the norm of time-delay systems by solving the delay lyapunov equation, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 56 (4) (2011) 814–825.
- [18] N. v. d. Wouw, W. Michiels, B. Besselink, Model reduction for delay differential equations with guaranteed stability and error bound, *Automatica* 55 (2015) 132–139.
- [19] S. N. Lordejani, B. Besselink, A. Chaillet, N. v. d. Wouw, Model order reduction for linear time delay systems: A delay-dependent approach based on energy functionals, *Automatica* 112 (2020) 108701.
- [20] W. Michiels, E. Jarlebring, K. Meerbergen, Krylov-based model order reduction of time-delay systems, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 32 (4) (2011) 1399–1421.
- [21] Y. Zhang, Y. Su, A memory-efficient model order reduction for time-delay systems, *BIT Numerical Mathematics* 53 (2013) 1047–1073.
- [22] M. Saadvandi, K. Meerbergen, E. Jarlebring, On dominant poles and model reduction of second order time-delay systems, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 62 (2012) 21–34.
- [23] X. Du, F. Fan, D. Dawei, Finite-frequency model order reduction of discrete-time linear time-delayed systems, *Nonlinear Dynamics* 83 (2016) 2485–2496.
- [24] L. Wu, W. Zheng, Weighted h_∞ model reduction for linear switched systems with time-varying delay, *Automatica* 45 (2009) 186–193.
- [25] M. Heinkenschloss, T. Reis, A. C. Antoulas, Balanced truncation model reduction for systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions, *Automatica* 47 (3) (2011) 559–564.
- [26] A. Daraghme, C. Hartmann, N. Qatanani, Balanced model reduction of linear systems with nonzero initial conditions: Singular perturbation approximation, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 353 (2019) 295–307.
- [27] C. Schröder, M. Voigt, Balanced truncation model reduction with a priori error bounds for lti systems with nonzero initial value, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 420 (2023) 114708.
- [28] C. Beattie, S. Gugercin, V. Mehrmann, Model reduction for systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions, *Systems & Control Letters* 99 (2017) 99–106.
- [29] J. Przybilla, I. P. Duff, P. Benner, Model reduction for second-order systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions, *Systems & Control Letters* 183 (2024) 105671.
- [30] Q. Song, Y. Jiang, Z. Xiao, Arnoldi-based model order reduction for linear systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions, *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 354 (18) (2017) 8570–8585.

- [31] Y. Li, Y. Jiang, P. Yang, Model order reduction of port-Hamiltonian systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions via approximate finite-time Gramians, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 422 (2022) 126959.
- [32] X. Cao, P. Benner, I. P. Duff, W. Schilders, Model order reduction for bilinear control systems with inhomogeneous initial conditions, *International Journal of Control* 94 (10) (2021) 2886–2895.
- [33] Z. Wang, Y. Jiang, K. Xu, Discrete orthogonal polynomials reduced models based on shift-transformation and discrete Walsh functions, *International Journal of Systems Science* 53 (10) (2022) 2045–2062.
- [34] J. L. Walsh, A closed set of normal orthogonal functions, *American Journal of Mathematics* 45 (1) (1923) 5–24.
- [35] S. Kak, Binary sequences and redundancy, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* (4) (1974) 399–401.
- [36] F. Lewis, D. Fountain, Walsh function analysis of linear and bilinear discrete time systems, *International Journal of Control* 53 (4) (1991) 847–853.
- [37] J. Chou, I. Horng, Simple methods for the shift-transformation matrix, direct-product matrix and summation matrix of discrete Walsh series, *International Journal of Control* 43 (4) (1986) 1339–1342.
- [38] R. King, P. Paraskevopoulos, Digital laguerre filters, *International Journal of Circuit Theory and Applications* 5 (1) (1977) 81–91.
- [39] H. Li, X. Wang, X. Zhang, Lyapunov matrices approach to robust stability analysis for linear discrete-time systems with multiple delays, in: *2019 Chinese Control Conference, Guangzhou, China, 2019*, pp. 1312–1316.
- [40] T. Penzl, Algorithms for model reduction of large dynamical systems, *Linear algebra and its applications* 415 (2-3) (2006) 322–343.
- [41] Y. S. Suh, Diagonal balanced truncation of discrete delay systems, *Automatica* 35 (11) (1999) 1855–1860.
- [42] S. Huang, Automatic vehicle following with integrated throttle and brake control, *International Journal of Control* 72 (1) (1999) 75–83.
- [43] G. Scarcioffi, A. Astolfi, Model reduction by moment matching for linear time-delay systems, *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* 47 (3) (2014) 9462–9467.
- [44] U. Baur, C. Beattie, P. Benner, S. Gugercin, Interpolatory projection methods for parameterized model reduction, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 33 (5) (2011) 2489–2518.